



Pacific Sociological Association

Social Origins and School Failure: A Reexamination of Cohen's Theory of Working-Class Delinquency

Author(s): Delos H. Kelly and Robert W. Balch

Source: *The Pacific Sociological Review*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Oct., 1971), pp. 413-430

Published by: [University of California Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1388540>

Accessed: 21/06/2014 03:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sage Publications, Inc. and Pacific Sociological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Pacific Sociological Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SOCIAL ORIGINS AND SCHOOL FAILURE

A Reexamination of Cohen's Theory of Working-Class Delinquency

DELOS H. KELLY

State University College of New York (Geneseo)

ROBERT W. BALCH

University of Montana

It is widely assumed that the incidence of juvenile delinquency is inversely related to social class, and many popular theories of delinquent behavior are predicated on this assumption. One of the most influential of these theories was formulated by Albert Cohen (1955). According to Cohen, middle-class success goals permeate our society. No one is immune to them, including school boys from working-class homes. Unfortunately, working-class boys are sorely ill-equipped to compete for success in a middle-class world. In Cohen's (1955: 97) words, the working-class person "is less likely to possess, to value or to cultivate the polish, the sophistication, the fluency, the 'good appearance' and the 'personality' so useful in 'selling oneself' and manipulating others in the middle-class world." These liabilities become painfully evident in the classroom. Schools are thoroughly middle-class institutions, and, according to Cohen, students are inevitably evaluated in terms of a "middle-class measuring rod."

AUTHOR'S NOTE: *The research on which this paper is based was supported by funds granted by the National Institute of Mental Health (Grant MH14806 "Maturational Reform and Rural Delinquency"). The authors are indebted to Marion Dearman, Tony Knight, Bill Pink, and particularly Kenneth Polk for the critical comments they offered on a much earlier draft of this paper.*

This yardstick emphasizes ambition, worldly asceticism, respect for property, and so on (Cohen, 1955: 88-93). Because working-class boys are so poorly equipped to compete against middle-class standards, they ultimately fail—academically and socially. Theirs is a painful dilemma. They have internalized middle-class goals, but are unable to achieve them. Cohen contends that many of these boys resolve their dilemmas by collectively rejecting the middle-class way of life and turning its standards upside down, instituting a status system of their own. This is the delinquent solution which occupies Cohen's attention. It is the working-class boy's answer to status frustration (Cohen, 1955: ch. 5).

There have been surprisingly few explicit attempts to test Cohen's theory. In one well-known study, Reiss and Rhodes (1963) examined the relationship between "status deprivation" and delinquency. As a measure of relative deprivation, they used responses to the question, "Would you say that most of the students in your school have better clothes and a better house to live in than you have?" (Reiss and Rhodes, 1963: 137). Contrary to what Cohen might have predicted, they found only a slight relationship between social class and perceived deprivation, and virtually no relationship between deprivation and delinquency. However, their study cannot be considered a fair test of Cohen's theory.

Their measure of status deprivation does not tap the process so critical to the theory. According to Cohen, working-class boys are frustrated because they are unable to compete for rewards in a middle-class environment, particularly the school. One may be thoroughly deprived according to the Reiss and Rhodes criterion, yet still possess the intellectual and social skills necessary to win approval and respect from middle-class adults.

In addition, Cohen says that delinquency is a *solution* for status deprivation. Delinquent boys reject the middle-class values they cannot obtain. However, their solution is far from perfect. In fact, "lingering ambivalence" toward middle-class values is responsible for the reaction formation which Cohen

(1955: 132, 133) proposes to explain the malicious content of the delinquent subculture. If Cohen's reaction formation thesis is true, then delinquent boys should vigorously *deny* that they are deprived. Reiss and Rhodes used questionnaires to assess status deprivation, but depth interviews may be required to reveal feelings of deprivation which boys are not even willing to admit to themselves. On the other hand, if delinquent boys are not as ambivalent as Cohen says—if they really *do* reject middle-class values—they have no reason to feel deprived. In that case, delinquency and status deprivation would not be strongly related in a cross-sectional study like that of Reiss and Rhodes, even with depth interviews. Status deprivation, therefore, is an elusive variable which is difficult to handle empirically.

The authors also deal with only three variables in Cohen's system—social class, status deprivation, and delinquency. While these are Cohen's most important variables, exclusive attention to them has obscured the intervening processes by which they are related. Specifically, Cohen discusses several unfortunate consequences of growing up in a working-class family which lead to juvenile misbehavior.

Because working-class boys are intellectually, emotionally, and behaviorally unable to succeed in school, they fail more often than their middle-class peers. Cohen says (1955: 115), "both in terms of 'conduct' and in terms of academic achievement, the failures in the classroom are drawn disproportionately from the lower social class levels." Working-class boys hold themselves in low regard, especially when they compare themselves intellectually to higher-class boys. Their low self-esteem emerges from the constant negative appraisal they presumably receive from their teachers. "It seems reasonable to assume that out of all this there arise feelings of inferiority and perhaps resentment and hostility" (Cohen, 1955: 112). "The failure of our own behavior to conform to our own expectations is an elementary and commonplace fact which gives rise to the tremendously important consequences of guilt, self-recrimination, anxiety and self-hatred" (Cohen, 1955:

126). Finally, Cohen says (1955: 119) working-class boys are likely to be underinvolved in school activities. "Working-class children are less likely to participate, and if they participate are less likely to achieve prominence, in extra-curricular activities, which are an important arena for the competition for status in the eyes of the students themselves." They are uninvolved partly by choice, defensively avoiding an unpleasant situation, and partly because they are excluded by middle-class students (Cohen: 1955: 118, 119).

There are two ways these boys can cope with their failure. The one which occupies most of Cohen's (1955: ch. 5) attention is, of course, delinquency. Another way of coping with failure is to physically withdraw from school, by either cutting classes or dropping out (Cohen, 1955: 129). According to Cohen, the second solution characterizes nondelinquent "corner boys" as well as delinquents.

Thus Cohen says it is not social class per se that causes delinquent and conforming behavior. Rather, the effect of class background on delinquency depends on the working-class boy's experience in school. Cohen's *independent variable* is social class. His *dependent variables* are school avoidance and delinquency. Academic performance, self-evaluation, and school involvement are all *intervening variables*. If Cohen's theory is correct, the following pattern of relationships should exist:

- (1) Social class will be directly related to academic performance, self-evaluation, and school involvement.
- (2) Social class will be inversely related to school avoidance and delinquency.
- (3) Academic performance, self-evaluation, and school involvement will be inversely related to school avoidance and delinquency.
- (4) When the intervening school variables are held constant, the relationships between social class and the dependent variables will disappear or be substantially reduced.

Since social class is temporally prior to all other variables in the system, this pattern of relationships would clearly indicate that

the school variables are intervening rather than antecedent. See Rosenberg (1968: ch. 2) for a discussion of intervening and antecedent variables.

You will notice that our hypotheses pertain to the working-class boy's attempt to cope with his *school experience*. As Cohen (1955: 112) points out, "one of the situations in which children of all social levels come together and compete for status in terms of the same set of middle-class criteria and in which working-class children are most likely to be found wanting is in the school." Although Cohen apparently believes the school is only one of many such situations, so much of his discussion revolves around the school that we consider it essential to his theory.

We have also completely ignored the concept of status deprivation, for two reasons. First, as we suggested above, the concept is extremely difficult to handle, at least within the context of Cohen's theory. Second, social class is really Cohen's most important independent variable. He apparently believes the relationship between working-class origins and status deprivation is so strong that middle-class delinquency calls for a completely different explanation (Cohen, 1955: 157-169). Exclusive attention to status deprivation would ignore the main thrust of Cohen's theory because, conceivably, status deprivation may be independent of social class. Indeed, Reiss and Rhodes (1963) found evidence of status deprivation at all class levels, and Elliott (1962) and Stinchcombe (1964) found that their measures of status frustration were related to both middle- and working-class delinquency.

PROCEDURES

Data for the present study were drawn from an ongoing investigation of adolescent boys in western Oregon. In 1964, a questionnaire containing a wide variety of demographic, school, family, work, and peer variables was administered to all male sophomores (1,227) enrolled in the high schools of a medium-

sized county (1960 population of 120,888). Data were also drawn from school transcripts and juvenile court records.

Using the Hollingshead Index of Social Position, together with an Oregon supplement, we classified our subjects as middle or working class according to their father's occupation. Middle-class occupations included executive, professional, sales, and clerical positions. Skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled jobs made up the working-class category.¹ Of our initial population of 1,227, 1,011 boys could be classified. Forty-eight percent of these were placed in the working-class category. The remaining 216 subjects who could not be classified were concentrated in unspecified farming and logging occupations.

We used four indicators to operationalize our intervening variables. Academic performance was determined by one's accumulated grade point average at the beginning of his sophomore year. Grades were divided into "high" (2.00-4.00) and "low" (0.0-1.99) categories.² In order to ascertain academic self-evaluation, responses to four highly intercorrelated questionnaire items were combined in a four-factor index. Our respondents were asked to compare themselves with other sophomore boys on four school-related dimensions: spelling ability, language usage, grades, and general intelligence. Each time a boy rated himself average or above on one of the four dimensions, he received a score of one. If he rated himself below average, he received a score of zero. All those with total scores of two or less were regarded as having a low opinion of their academic capabilities. We used two indicators to tap the dimension of school involvement. Positive and negative affect toward school were determined by responses to a Likert-type item: "School is dull and boring." Boys who agreed with this statement were considered to have negative feelings toward school. Another aspect of school involvement is participation in extracurricular activities. We asked, "How many in-school clubs, organizations and athletic groups do you belong to?" Boys who said they did not belong to any groups were classified as uninvolved in school activities.

Eight items make up our dependent variables. We classified all boys with four or more absences during their freshman year as truants. (The median for the sample was 2.5.) Boys who eventually dropped out of school before graduation were classified as dropouts. Delinquency was determined in three different ways: (1) boys who had appeared in court at least once were classified as delinquent; (2) boys who had appeared in court more than once were classified as frequent delinquents; and (3) those who had been apprehended for committing felonies were classified as serious offenders.³ Finally, three additional items were included as indicators of youthful rebellion which is not specifically delinquent: "Do you smoke?" "Do you drink beer?" and a Likert-type item, "I really enjoy 'cruising around' at night just to see what is going on."

Before proceeding, some general comments on our sample and indicators are in order. First, one could argue that Cohen was concerned with urban slum delinquency, and therefore our sample cannot legitimately be used to test hypotheses derived from his theory. However, the only references to urban slum delinquency in *Delinquent Boys* are in the second chapter, where Cohen (1955: 32,33,43) briefly alludes to the prevalence of delinquency in disorganized "interstitial" areas. Otherwise there is nothing in the book which would restrict his theory to the urban scene. Presumably working-class boys encounter the same middle-class barriers in small communities as they do in big cities.

Second, we have been severely handicapped because our data were originally collected for reasons unrelated to the purposes of this study. For example, we have not derived any hypotheses about the delinquent *subculture* because there were simply no items in the questionnaire which dealt with this aspect of Cohen's theory. For the rest of our hypotheses we have had to pick and choose to find appropriate indicators, sometimes with less than satisfying results. Hopefully the weaknesses of any single indicator are overcome by the consistent pattern of results which emerges in our analysis.

FINDINGS

Table 1 shows the relationships between the independent and each of our intervening (school) and dependent variables. Although the relationships are small, they are all in the predicted direction. Working-class boys are more likely to get poor grades, have low self-evaluations, dislike school, and be uninvolved in extracurricular activities.

The relationships with respect to school avoidance and deviant behavior are even smaller. As we predicted, working-class boys are more likely to cut classes, drop out of school, smoke, drink, and go cruising with their friends. However, the relationship between delinquency and social class is slight to nonexistent. The differences between middle- and working-class boys on our three indicators of delinquency are only two, one,

TABLE 1
Academic Performance, Academic Self-Evaluation, School Involvement, and School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior, by Social Origins (in percentages)^a

	Social Origins	
	Middle Class	Working Class
Academic Performance		
Failing grade point average	21	32
Academic Self-Evaluation		
Low self-evaluation	39	60
School Involvement		
Negative affect toward school	27	37
Uninvolved in activities	27	37
School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior		
Truancy	30	34
Dropout	8	15
Smoking	17	25
Drinking	16	23
Cruising	56	70
Delinquency (juvenile court contact)	24	26
(1) Frequent delinquency (more than one contact)	10	11
(2) Serious delinquency (felony count)	12	16

a. Percentages rounded to nearest whole percent.

and four percent.⁴ The mean percentage difference for the entire table is only six percent—considerably less than we expected.

Table 2 shows the relationships between our intervening and dependent variables. The relationships between grade point average and each of the dependent variables are fairly strong and consistently in the predicted direction. The lower a boy's grade point average, the more likely he is to cut classes, drop out, smoke, drink, and go cruising. There is also an inverse relationship between grades and each indicator of delinquent behavior.

The remaining data in Table 2 exhibit a similar pattern. Self-evaluation, affect toward school, and involvement in school activities are all inversely related to our dependent variables. Although none of them is as strongly related to the dependent variables as grade point average, the relationships are consistently in the predicted direction.

So far the pattern of results is only partly consistent with Cohen's theory. Our school variables are consistently related to the independent and dependent variables in the way we predicted. However, not all of our dependent variables are related to social class, and even then the relationships are smaller than we expected. Delinquency, our most important dependent variable, is not related to social origins, even when measured in three different ways. Nevertheless, before we can draw any conclusions from the data, we must examine the relationships between social class and each of the dependent variables while holding the intervening variables constant. If academic performance, self-evaluation, and school involvement really are intervening variables, then the observed relationships between social origins and the dependent variables should disappear when the school variables are controlled.

In Table 3, we examine the relationship between social origins and each of the dependent variables while controlling academic performance. For most of the dependent variables, the observed class differences persist. Grades also have a strong independent effect on each dependent variable, and there is a

TABLE 2
School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior, by Academic Performance, Academic Self-Evaluation, Affect Toward School, and Involvement in School Activities (in percentages)

	Grade Point Average		Academic Self-Evaluation Index		Affect Toward School		Involvement in School Activities	
	High	Low	High	Low	Positive	Negative	Involved	Uninvolved
Truancy	27	50	29	38	31	35	27	38
Dropout	3	33	5	20	7	20	6	18
Smoking	15	39	15	28	15	35	14	27
Drinking	17	30	17	25	15	33	15	25
Cruising	57	80	54	73	57	75	61	66
Delinquency	20	36	21	28	21	32	21	27
(1) Frequent	7	21	9	13	8	16	8	13
(2) Serious	3	9	12	16	12	18	12	15

TABLE 3
School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior, by Social Origins and Academic Performance (in percentages)

	Grade Point Average			
	High		Low	
	MC ^a	WC	MC	WC
Truancy	27	26	47	51
Dropout	2	4	28	34
Smoking	11	18	38	41
Drinking	14	19	29	31
Cruising	51	62	78	82
Delinquency	19	22	44	35
(1) Frequent	6	7	26	20
(2) Serious	9	13	24	22

a. MC—middle class; WC—working class.

tendency for the effects of class and grades to combine in an additive fashion. There are four exceptions to the general pattern. For boys with high grades, class differences in truancy—which were slight to begin with—disappear. For those with low grades, middle-class boys are somewhat more likely to be delinquent on each of the three indicators. We are not sure what significance to attach to the latter finding. According to Stinchcombe (1964: ch. 6) middle-class failures in school are more likely to be rebellious than are working-class boys who fail. He believed that failure is more frustrating for middle-class boys because they have higher aspirations. However, if this explanation were valid, middle-class boys with low grades should also have higher rates of truancy, dropout, smoking, drinking, and cruising. Moreover, Stinchcombe (1964: chs. 1 and 2) was not concerned with delinquency, but with “rebellion” and “expressive alienation” which are conceptually very similar to our nondelinquent dependent variables. In order to invoke Stinchcombe’s theory to explain our curious class differences in delinquency, we would have to find similar—perhaps even stronger—differences in the rest of our dependent variables. At any rate, none of these results could have been predicted from Cohen’s theory.

There is a very similar pattern in Table 4. Class differences do not disappear as predicted, and self-evaluation is related to each of the dependent variables even when class is controlled. Among those with low self-evaluations, middle-class boys are a bit more likely to have at least one juvenile court contact, but for all practical purposes there are no class differences in the frequency or seriousness of delinquency.

In Tables 5 and 6, the pattern is even more consistent. Social origins and the control variables continue to have independent, additive effects on the dependent variables. Generally speaking, class differences remain small and are negligible for delinquency.

DISCUSSION

Our results clearly do not support Cohen's theory. For all practical purposes, there is no relationship between delinquency and social class. There is a slight relationship between class and the rest of the dependent variables, but it does not disappear when academic performance, self-evaluation, or school involvement are controlled. In other words, the relationship between social class and our dependent variables does not depend on school experience as Cohen implies. Cohen erroneously assumed

TABLE 4
School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior, by Social Origins and Academic Self-Evaluation (in percentages)

	Academic Self-Evaluation Index			
	High		Low	
	MC	WC	MC	WC
Truancy	27	28	36	37
Dropout	4	6	14	20
Smoking	11	19	26	30
Drinking	13	19	21	26
Cruising	47	60	72	76
Delinquency	19	26	31	26
(1) Frequent	8	9	14	13
(2) Serious	11	15	15	16

TABLE 5
School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior, by Social Origins and
Affect Toward School (in percentages)

	Affect Toward School			
	Positive		Negative	
	MC	WC	MC	WC
Truancy	29	29	31	37
Dropout	5	7	12	23
Smoking	12	16	27	40
Drinking	11	16	30	34
Cruising	50	64	68	77
Delinquency	20	21	34	33
(1) Frequent	8	7	15	17
(2) Serious	11	12	16	21

TABLE 6
School Avoidance and Deviant Behavior, by Social Origins and
Involvement in School Activities (in percentages)

	Involvement in School Activities			
	Involved		Uninvolved	
	MC	WC	MC	WC
Truancy	25	26	37	37
Dropout	6	7	10	20
Smoking	12	16	22	30
Drinking	13	17	19	26
Cruising	57	67	56	70
Delinquency	22	21	26	29
(1) Frequent	8	8	13	14
(2) Serious	11	13	13	17

that academic performance, self-evaluation, and school involvement are intervening variables. Instead, social class and the school variables are independently related to the dependent variables. Furthermore, the effect of social class is weak and inconsistent, while the four school variables are uniformly and in many cases strongly related to the dependent variables. Of all the variables, academic performance is most strongly related to each of the dependent variables.

In part, our small class differences could be a function of geography. Our data were collected in a relatively young western country. In the East, where class lines are more rigid, social class may be a more influential variable. Nevertheless, our results are similar to those reported in a recent study of Tennessee high school students by Rhodes and Reiss (1969). They found that English grades were strongly related to apathy, truancy, juvenile court contacts, and serious delinquency, even when social class was held constant. English mark was also much more strongly related to their dependent variables than was social class.

Our findings may have some additional theoretical and practical implications. They lend support to a "school status" theory of delinquency. Although school status advocates vary in emphasis, they seem to agree that one's location in the reward structure of the school is a far more important determinant of nonconforming behavior than one's social class background (Schafer and Polk, 1967).

In his study of an English secondary school, Hargreaves (1967) found that boys in the school's lowest "streams" (tracks) were treated as if they were incapable of assuming responsibility. Their teachers treated them with disdain and regarded their classroom duties as more custodial than academic. On the other hand, boys in the top stream received considerable recognition and encouragement from their teachers. They were carefully groomed for their grammar-school qualifying examination and maintained close ties with the faculty. Each stream also had its own teachers and its own activities. Not surprisingly, interaction and friendship choices were largely stream-bound. Unlike their upper-stream counterparts, boys in the lowest streams received poor grades, lacked commitment to school, and were more involved in troublesome activities. Hargreaves believed that differences between the streams were caused by the streaming process itself; but his data are inconclusive because he failed to control background factors like social class.

Fortunately, a study by Schafer et al., (1970) is more definitive. Their data showed that even when social class, IQ, and past performance were held constant, there were still significant differences between upper and lower tracks in two midwestern high schools. Students in the lower track were more apt to receive low grades, drop out of school, and become delinquent.

Academic failure may have similar negative consequences, regardless of track position. Gold (1963) found that delinquents had lower grades and more negative attitudes toward school than nondelinquents *before* their first police contact. Stinchcombe (1964) believed that failure leads to alienation and rebellion because it severely restricts one's chances of achieving his occupational goals. As we mentioned in the previous section, Stinchcombe contends that failure is especially damaging for middle-class boys because they have high aspirations. If middle-class boys fail, they will be headed for working-class occupations. But if lower-class boys fail, they will simply retain their present socioeconomic status.

However, Polk (1969) was unable to support the hypothesis that downwardly mobile white-collar boys are more rebellious than their blue-collar counterparts. Instead, school failure had a strong independent effect on rebellion. Regardless of their social class, boys who were failing in school were more likely to be delinquent than boys who were doing well. Polk concluded that Stinchcombe may have given too much weight to the implications of school experience for one's future status in life. Rather, the immediate effects of failure might be more damaging. For example, Vinter and Sarri (1965: 9) found that poor students were denied

a wide variety of privileges and opportunities within the school. They lost esteem among their classmates, they were seldom chosen for minor but prestigious classroom or school assignments, and they were excluded from participation in certain extra-curricular activities. This process, in turn, often subjected such students to negative parental responses, representing a third penalty.

Exclusion from school activities may be critical. Polk and Halferty (1966) have described involvement in extracurricular activities as a series of "side-bets" that keep students interested in school and out of trouble. Even students having no academic interests whatsoever have an interest in conformity if they are highly involved in school activities. At any rate, whether we follow Stinchcombe or Polk in our interpretation of school failure, the school-status model is still more versatile than Cohen's theory because it can explain both middle- and working-class delinquency.

While our data are consistent with the school-status approach, they do not permit us to choose between competing hypotheses. Assignment to a lower track apparently increases the probability of failure as well as delinquency, but many writers have treated failure as an *independent* variable. Although we are speculating, we believe that failure probably has an effect on youthful deviance that is independent of track position. Boys in the lowest track who are also failing should be the most delinquent of all.

We have assumed, of course, that failure causes delinquency, but the causal arrow could point the other way. In fact, it probably points in both directions, but there is good reason for treating school experience as an independent variable. Gold's (1963) study clearly shows that failure *preceded* delinquency. Similarly, Elliott (1966) found that the delinquency rates of future dropouts *declined* after they left school. In fact, their out-of-school rates were lower than the delinquency rates of those boys who stayed in school and eventually graduated.

What, then, are the practical implications of this study? Although the weak relationships between social class and our dependent variables may be disappointing to some, they should be heartening to those who want to *do* something about delinquency. We cannot change a boy's social class, but we can do something about his school. If we can make the classroom, and school activities generally, more rewarding and more engrossing for students, perhaps we can reduce the amount of juvenile delinquency. Like so many glib recommendations, this is

more easily said than done, but no one can deny that it is easier to modify a school than to change the social backgrounds of its students.

NOTES

1. In our analysis of the class variable we have found no indication that dichotomization of the occupational scale alters our results.

2. 4.00 perfect.

3. Many writers have objected to the use of official statistics as an indicator of delinquent behavior. Unfortunately, our data did not include self-reported delinquency. However, there is some evidence that the most *serious* delinquent acts do come to the attention of the court. The trivial offenses most often go undetected (Chilton, 1967; Gibbons, 1970: 24-27; Gold, 1966). Hopefully, we have overcome some of the weaknesses of the official statistics by taking seriousness into consideration.

4. Even when we examine the percentage of delinquents by social status without dichotomizing the occupational scale, there is still virtually no relationship.

REFERENCES

- Chilton, Roland J.
1967 "Middle-class delinquency and specific offense analysis." Pp. 91-101 in E. W. Vaz (ed.) *Middle-Class Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cohen, Albert K.
1955 *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. New York: Free Press.
- Elliott, Delbert S.
1962 "Delinquency and perceived opportunity." *Soc. Inquiry* 32 (Spring): 216-227.
1966 "Delinquency, school attendance and dropout." *Social Problems* 13 (Winter): 307-314.
- Gibbons, Don C.
1970 *Delinquent Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Gold, Martin
1963 *Status Forces in Delinquent Boys*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
1966 "Undetected delinquent behavior." *J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 3 (January): 27-46.

- Hargreaves, David
1967 *Social Relations in a Secondary School*. New York: Humanities Press.
- Polk, Kenneth
1969 "Class, strain and rebellion among adolescents." *Social Problems* 17 (Fall): 214-224.
——— and David S. Halferty
1966 "Adolescence, commitment, and delinquency." *J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 3 (July): 82-96.
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr. and A. Lewis Rhodes
1963 "Status deprivation and delinquent behavior." *Soc. Q.* 4 (Spring): 135-149.
- Rhodes, A. Lewis and Albert J. Reiss, Jr.
1969 "Apathy, truancy and delinquency as adaptations to school failure." *Social Forces* 48 (September): 12-22.
- Rosenberg, Morris
1968 *The Logic of Survey Analysis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schafer, Walter E. and Kenneth Polk
1967 "Delinquency and the schools." Pp. 222-277 in *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Schafer, Walter E., Carol Olexa, and Kenneth Polk
1970 "Programmed for social class: tracking in high school." *Trans-Action* 7 (October): 39-46, 63.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur
1964 *Rebellion in a High School*. Chicago: Quadrangle.
- Vinter, Robert D. and Rosemary C. Sarri
1965 "Malperformance in the public school: a group work approach." *Social Work* 10 (January): 3-13.